

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Kristian Jarred Stubbs,)	C/A: 4:12-2412-TLW-TER
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	REPORT AND
vs.)	RECOMMENDATION
)	
Kenney Boone, Sheriff,)	
)	
Defendant(s).)	
_____)	

The plaintiff, Kristian Jarred Stubbs (Plaintiff), proceeding *pro se*, brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.¹ Plaintiff is a pretrial detainee at the J. Reuben Long Detention Center, and files this action *in forma pauperis* under 28 U.S.C. § 1915. The Complaint names Kenney Boone, Sheriff, as defendant.² Plaintiff claims that Defendant falsely arrested him. Plaintiff seeks a declaratory judgment to that effect, monetary damages, and that Defendant be punished. The Complaint should be dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

Pro Se and In Forma Pauperis Review

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made of the *pro se* Complaint pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915 and § 1915A, and the Prison Litigation Reform Act, Pub. L. No. 104-134, 110 Stat. 1321 (1996). This review has been conducted in light of the following precedents: *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662 (2009), *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25 (1992), *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989), *Haines v. Kerner*, 404

¹ Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B), and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), D.S.C., the undersigned is authorized to review such complaints for relief and submit findings and recommendations to the District Court.

² Title 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a) requires review of a “complaint in a civil action in which a prisoner seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity.”

U.S. 519 (1972), *Nasim v. Warden, Maryland House of Correction*, 64 F.3d 951 (4th Cir. 1995) (en banc), and *Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d 70 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Complaint herein has been filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, which permits an indigent litigant to commence an action in federal court without prepaying the administrative costs of proceeding with the lawsuit. To protect against possible abuses of this privilege, the statute allows a district court to dismiss the case upon a finding that the action “fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted,” “is frivolous or malicious,” or “seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). A finding of frivolity can be made where the complaint “lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.” *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. at 31. Hence, under § 1915(e)(2)(B), a claim based on a meritless legal theory may be dismissed *sua sponte*. See *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. at 327.

This Court is required to liberally construe *pro se* complaints. *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007). Such complaints are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys, *id.*; *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978), and a federal district court is charged with liberally construing a *pro se* complaint to allow the development of a potentially meritorious case, *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 5, 9 (1980); *Cruz v. Beto*, 405 U.S. 319 (1972). When a federal court is evaluating a *pro se* complaint, the plaintiff's factual allegations are assumed to be true. *Erickson*, 551 U.S. at 93 (citing *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555-56 (2007)). The mandated liberal construction afforded to *pro se* pleadings means that if the court can reasonably read the pleadings to state a valid claim on which the plaintiff could prevail, it should do so; however, a district court may not rewrite a petition to include claims that were never presented, *Barnett v. Hargett*, 174 F.3d 1128 (10th Cir. 1999), construct the plaintiff's legal arguments for him,

Small v. Endicott, 998 F.2d 411 (7th Cir. 1993), or “conjure up questions never squarely presented” to the court, *Beaudett v. City of Hampton*, 775 F.2d 1274, 1278 (4th Cir. 1985).

Thus, the requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim cognizable in a federal district court. *See Weller v. Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 901 F.2d 387 (4th Cir. 1990); *see also Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 129 S. Ct. 1937 (2009) (outlining pleading requirements under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure). The United States Supreme Court has recently made clear that, under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8, a plaintiff in a civil action must do more than make mere conclusory statements to state a claim. *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 677–78; *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555. Rather, the complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state a claim that is plausible on its face.³ *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678; *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 570. Additionally, the reviewing court need only accept as true the complaint's factual allegations, not its legal conclusions. *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 678; *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555.

Discussion

The Complaint is filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, which “‘is not itself a source of substantive rights,’ but merely provides ‘a method for vindicating federal rights elsewhere conferred.’” *Albright v. Oliver*, 510 U.S. 266, 271 (1994) (quoting *Baker v. McCollan*, 443 U.S.

³ Although the *Iqbal* Court was addressing pleading standards in the procedural context of a motion under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure (FRCP) 12(b)(6), the Court finds that those standards also apply in its initial screening of a complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2) and 1915A, since *Iqbal* discusses the general pleading standards of FRCP 8, which apply in all civil actions. *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 677–80. Moreover, §§ 1915(e)(2) and 1915A(b) permit *sua sponte* dismissal of a complaint that fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, which is essentially the same standard found in FRCP 12(b)(6). *See McLean v. United States*, 566 F.3d 391, 396 (4th Cir. 2009) (“When the word ‘dismissed’ is coupled with the words ‘[for] fail[ure] to state a claim upon which relief may be granted,’ the complete phrase has a well-established legal meaning.”).

137, 144 n.3 (1979)). A legal action under § 1983 allows “a party who has been deprived of a federal right under the color of state law to seek relief.” *City of Monterey v. Del Monte Dunes at Monterey, Ltd.*, 526 U.S. 687, 707 (1999). To state a claim under § 1983, a plaintiff must allege two essential elements: (1) that a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States was violated, and (2) that the alleged violation was committed by a person acting under the color of state law. *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988).

This Court provides a form to facilitate the filing of a civil rights complaint. At the section entitled, “STATEMENT OF CLAIM,” the form instructs the complainant to: “State here, as briefly as possible, the facts of your case. Describe how each defendant is involved. Include also the names of other persons involved, dates, and places. . . . Use as much space as you need. Attach an extra sheet if necessary.” (See ECF No. 1, at 3.) In response, Plaintiff wrote only, “On 08-27-2011 I was falsly[sic] arrested by my defendants.” (*Id.*)

The Complaint herein clearly fails to state a claim as it sets forth no facts, simply a legal conclusion. Although the Court must liberally construe a *pro se* complaint, Plaintiff must do more than make mere conclusory statements to state a claim. *Brown v. Zavaras*, 63 F.3d 967 (10th Cir. 1995); *Adams v. Rice*, 40 F.3d 72 (4th Cir. 1994); *White v. White*, 886 F.2d 721, 723 (4th Cir. 1989) (dismissing the complaint because it “failed to contain any factual allegations tending to support [complainant’s] bare assertion”). While Plaintiff is not required in the Complaint to plead facts sufficient to prove his case as an evidentiary matter, he must allege facts that support a claim for relief. *Bass v. Dupont*, 324 F.3d 761, 765 (4th Cir. 2003). This Court is not required to develop tangential claims from scant assertions in the complaint. See *Beaudett v. City of Hampton*, 775 F.2d

1274 (4th Cir. 1985). As the Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted under § 1983, it should be dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii).

Recommendation

Accordingly, it is recommended that the District Judge dismiss the Complaint in this case without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915A (as soon as possible after docketing, district courts should review prisoner cases to determine whether they are subject to summary dismissal).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Thomas E. Rogers, III
Thomas E. Rogers, III
United States Magistrate Judge

November 16, 2012
Florence, South Carolina

Plaintiff's attention is directed to the important WARNING on the following page.

Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Specific written objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), (d). Filing by mail pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk
United States District Court
Post Office Box 2317
Florence, South Carolina 29503

Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).